

safeguards for workers, employers and the consuming public."

"This act, by its rigid judicial machinery," Col. Drew said, "will do the very opposite to avoiding stoppage of work by improving the spirit of co-operation. I have yet to hear of a single person or organization, outside of this Legislature, who approves of this act in its present form."

Col. Drew Gives Views.

Col. Drew outlined the principles of collective bargaining which he thought should be incorporated in any legislation passed by the House. They were 11 and included freedom of association, abolition of discrimination, establishment of a "comprehensive conciliation service for the prompt conciliation of disputes," a Labor Relations Board "with equal employer and employee representation and with a chairman appointed to represent the public interest," and adequate holidays with pay where applicable.

"That is the position we took before. That is the position we take now," said Col. Drew. But he insisted that "the object of any act dealing with collective bargaining should be to assure the rights of the workers without unfairness to those with whom they must be partners in production and without unfairness to the public at large." The act failed completely, he thought, because it kept the parties "at arms' length as though they were natural antagonists from the outset."

"It is vague, uncertain, negative in its statements," he declared.

The Opposition, he said, did not sit on the special committee "because we questioned the genuine purpose of that committee, and our decision has been more than justified by the result. This bill has some other origin not yet disclosed. Where did this idea of a one-judge Labor Court come from? The idea is thoroughly unsound. With a Labor Court, employers and employees become combatants in a legal battle."

The act, Col. Drew said, was "a hodge-podge of half-digested ideas," with "section after section uncertain in meaning. The uncertainty of the act would increase friction at every step."

J. J. Glass (Lib., Toronto-St. Andrew), supporting the bill, said those who had fears of reaction from it are very blind and have no reason to be concerned. The act might have shortcomings, but he advised the House to accept it and see how it works.

Major David Croll, Liberal member for Windsor - Walkerville, praised the principle of the legislation but found fault with the Labor Court provision. Major Croll favored a board on which a Supreme Court judge would be chairman and on which there would be representatives of labor and management.

Studded With Gremlins.

"The bill is studded with legalistic gremlins," observed Major Croll. "We ought to examine its provisions carefully. My chief objection is to the Labor Court. It does not provide an opportunity for the workers to have a forum where they can let off steam. I believe this opportunity should be given in the bill, and I am hopeful that amendments will be made."

Major Croll said the United Steel Corporation had been found guilty of sending imperfect steel to the Kaiser shipyards, and a subsidiary of this company in Ontario had strongly opposed the collective bargaining bill. This should be sufficient to make all thoughtful persons ponder on this problem, he declared.

A conciliation board rather than a labor court was what the working man desired, for working people feared the procedure of a formal court, said W. J. Duckworth (Prog. Con., Toronto-Dovercourt).